

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/554,733	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MANS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> N. Bhat	<b>Art Unit</b> 1764	

**All Participants:**

(1) N. Bhat.

(2) Dina Van Vuren.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 23 October 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*6*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner question applicant why bracketing was used in Claim 6 when originally this was in prior version of the claims. Because the examiner felt the bracketing would only cause confusion the examiner requested that the bracketing be removed from the claim in claim 6, and that without a blowing agent be positively and clearly stated as patentability hinged on this phrase. Applicant agreed to cancel the bracketing by examiner's amendment..